FOOD POLICY INSTITUTE

Consumer Acceptance of Genetically Modified Foods: Role of Product Benefits and Perceived Risks

Benjamin Onyango

Food Policy Institute
ASB III, 3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Phone: 732-932-1966 x 3115
Fax: 732-932-9544
Email: onyango@aesop.rutgers.edu
www.foodpolicyinstitute.org

Selected Paper Presented at the

2003 Annual Conference of the Food Distribution Research Society
Biloxi, Mississippi

October 25–29, 2003

This is Food Policy Institute Working Paper No. WP1003-012

Benjamin Onyango is a Research Associate at the Food Policy Institute, Rutgers University.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

Consumer Acceptance of Genetically Modified Foods: Role of Product Benefits and Perceived Risks

Benjamin Onyango

Abstract

This study examines consumer willingness to consume genetically modified food products with clearly stated benefits and risks. Results suggest that male; white, Southerners, and those with some college education are more likely to consume genetically modified fruits and vegetables. Trust in government, biotech industry, and medical professional on matters relating GM foods also have a positive impact on the willingness to consume GM foods; such trust allays fears associated with risks posed by GM technology.

Conversely, risk seems to negatively influence the willingness to consume GM products. Once the respondents are well informed of the risk of the product, this greatly diminished their willingness to consume such products. Older respondents (age above 55 years), those taking time to read food labels, and those with either high or low score on actual knowledge of GM based on a simple scientific quiz, are less enthusiastic toward GM foods. Income, religion and political affiliation did not play any significant role on influencing the willingness to consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables.

Consumer Acceptance of Genetically Modified Foods: Role of Product Benefits and Perceived Risks

Benjamin Onyango

Introduction

The application of biotechnology in agriculture and food production is often viewed as the future of the food system with the potential for enormous economic and social implications. Food biotechnology promises to bring a wide range of products with nutritional, environmental and other economic benefits. Despite such potential, genetically modified (GM) foods have so far received mixed regulatory and public acceptance in the U.S. and elsewhere (Hallman *et al*., 2002). While public debate remains embroiled in the controversy about risks and benefits of biotechnology, consumer acceptance of GM foods remain a critical factor in determining the future of this technology.

The overall state of public attitudes towards food biotechnology is best described as an ongoing tension between optimism about the benefits and fear about unforeseen risks from its use in plants and animals. The few existing studies suggest that consumer reception of GM foods is related to their perception of risks about GM foods, levels of risk aversion, knowledge of science, views about government and corporations as well as their moral and ethical views (Baker and Burnham, 2001; Moon and Balasubramanian, 2001). Studies have found that while people are more willing to accept GM foods that bring tangible benefits, their opposition comes from the perception that these foods carry unknown risks (Grimsrund *et al.*, 2002).

The evidence thus far on this issue is decidedly mixed in the U.S. and elsewhere (Bredahl, 1999; Gamble *et al*., 2000; Kelley, 1995; Macer *et al*., 1997; Hallman *et al*., 2002). Public debates on the subject have focused not only on the risks and benefits associated with biotechnology, but also on social, moral and ethical issues. Biotechnology advocates emphasize the potentials benefits to society in terms of improved products that will deliver distinct benefits to mankind. On the other hand, opponents often view biotechnology as an unnecessary interference with nature that has unknown and potentially disastrous consequences (Nelson, 2001).

Responding to public concerns about the perceived risks to people and the environment, most countries have introduced regulations on the use of genetic technologies (Engel *et al*., 1995). For instance, Europe has imposed restrictive regulations on GM crops in any portion of their food chain (Grossman & Endres, 2000). The food and drink manufacturers along with retailers in the U.K. voluntarily agreed to adopt labeling of food products containing GM soya and corn protein (IFST, 1998), and some retailers removed all GM products from their shelves. Other examples include India and Brazil who have refused to approve GM crops. Similarly, consumer concerns have made food companies reluctant to use GM food products (examples include McDonalds and Frito-Lay's refusal to use GM potatoes).

Despite the enormous importance of public acceptance of GM food products for the future of agricultural biotechnology, only a handful of studies have addressed the issue. In a recent study based on a sample of 50 college students, Lusk *et al*. (2001) examined the factors influencing consumer willingness to pay for non-GM corn chips. They found participants' willingness to pay to avoid GM corn chips was significantly related to their concerns about GM food products. However, none of the socio-economic variables were found to be statistically significant.

In another study, Moon and Balasubramanian (2001) reported that consumer acceptance of biotechnology was significantly related not only to their perceptions of risks and benefits associated with GM products, but also to their moral and ethical views. In addition, public views about multinational corporations, knowledge of science and technology, and trust in government were found to have significant influence on consumer acceptance of biotechnology. Baker and Burnham (2001) reported those consumers' cognitive variables (e.g., respondents' levels of risk aversion, opinions about GM foods) were important determinants of their acceptance of foods containing GM products, whereas the socio-economic variables did not have significant influence.

Although the studies above provide some insight into public acceptance of agricultural biotechnology, none of these studies directly explore the issue of consumers' willingness to consume GM food products in light of a product's risks and benefits. This study explores the willingness to consume GM foods that bring tangible benefits to consumers. We examine consumers' stated willingness to consume GM food products under two scenarios: (a) consumers are told only about the benefit of the GM food; and (b) consumers are told about both benefit and potential risk of the GM food product. Recent research on public attitudes towards biotechnology indicates that consumer acceptance of GM products is affected by factors such as type of product (e.g., whole or processed food) and the organisms involved, i.e., plant or animal based products (Hallman *et al*., 2002; Hamstra, 1998). Accordingly, public acceptance GM foods may differ across food product types, we compare the willingness to consume two GM products involving biotechnology: (i) Meat products from animals (cows and chickens) fed on GM corn or soybeans and (ii) GM fruits or vegetables that are consumed fresh.

Conceptual Framework and Empirical Model

Following the random utility framework, it is assumed that a consumer faces a choice between consuming or not on the basis of the stated benefit and risk of the GM product. Utilities derived from consuming the GM product with only benefit stated and the same one with benefit and risk stated is given by U_B and U_{BR}, respectively. However, these utility levels are not directly observable. The observable variables are the product attributes a (*a = B, BR*) and a vector of consumer characteristics (*x*). The random utility model assumes that the utility derived by consumer i from the product with attribute a (a = B, BR) can be expressed as:

$$U_{ai} = V_{ai} + \varepsilon_{ai} \tag{1}$$

where U_{ai} is the latent utility level attained by the i^{th} consumer by choosing the product attribute a (*a = B,BR*), V_{ai} is the explainable part of the latent utility that depends on the product attribute and the consumer characteristics, and ε_{ai} is the 'unexplainable' random component in U_{ai}.

The utility maximizing consumer will choose to consume the benefit only GM variety of the product if and only if $V_{Bi} + \varepsilon_{Bi} > V_{BRi} + \varepsilon_{BRi}$ or equivalently if $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{BRi} - \varepsilon_{Bi} < V_{Bi} - V_{BRi}$. since ε is unobservable and stochastic in nature, the consumer's choice is not deterministic and cannot be predicted exactly. Instead, the probability of any particular outcome can be derived. The probability that consumer i will consume the GM product variety with benefit is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} P_i &= \text{Prob}(\varepsilon_{BRi} - \varepsilon_{Bi} < V_{Bi} - V_{BRi}) \\ &= \text{Prob}(\varepsilon < V_{Bi} - V_{BRi}) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

To empirically implement the above conceptual framework, it is assumed that ε_{ai} is identically and independently distributed as type I extreme value (also known as Gumbel distribution) in which case $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{BRi} - \varepsilon_{Bi}$ follows the logistic distribution (Train, 2002). Under this distributional property ε_i, the probability that consumer i chooses the GM food product with benefit is given by the standard logit model discrete choice (McFadden 1974, 1984).

The indicator variable Z_i for the i^{th} consumer is modeled as a function of his/her willingness to consume the GM food variety with benefit and his/her personal attributes, socioeconomic and value attributes as follows:

$$Z_i = \mathbf{\beta X}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_k x_{ik} + \nu_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \qquad (3)$$

where x_{ij} denotes the j^{th} attribute of the i^{th} respondent, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ is the parameter vector to be estimated and ν_i is the disturbance term.

Survey Methodology, Variable Definition and Empirical Model

Data for this study comes from the national telephone and mail survey carried out between February 27, 2003, and April 1, 2003[1]. A sample size of 1200 was targeted so as to allow for a sampling error rate of ±3 percent[2]. Using a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI), a total of 1201 telephone surveys were completed, with the average cooperation rate for both versions of the survey was 65%[3]. At the end of the telephone survey, respondents were asked if they were interested in further participation through a mail survey. Those who agreed received a five-dollar incentive for their additional participation. A screener for respondents who had consumed ground beef, banana, or cornflakes occasionally was used to recruit mail survey participants. This resulted in 1199 potential respondents of the original 1201 phone subjects. Of the resulting 1199 potential respondents, 661 (55.1%) agreed to respond this additional questionnaire in exchange for nominal compensation of $5. Of the 661 who agreed, 409 (61.9%) returned a completed survey. A split-sample approach was employed where half of the respondents were mailed a survey with questions related to the benefit of the GM product (206)

[1] Interviewing was not conducted on March 21 and 22 due to the start of "Operation Iraqi Freedom" and the coverage it was receiving on television.

[2] The sampling error associated with a nationwide sample of 1,200 people is approximately ±3 percent with a 95 percent confidence interval. This means that if 50 percent of the respondents gave a particular response, the likely percentage of the entire adult population should be between 47 percent and 53 percent, 95 out of 100 times.

[3] The cooperation rate is the percentage of completed interviews (1201) over completed interviews (1201) + refusals (636). A more rigid calculation of response rate, defined as the percentage of completed interviews (1201) over total numbers in-frame telephone number (3120) yields a response rate of 38.5%.

and the other half were given questions with both the benefit and the potential risk of the product (203). However, due to non-response to certain questions by some there were 312 observations used for this analysis.

In the mail survey, respondents were asked to state their willingness to consume (eat) food products produced using genetic modification. The purpose or benefit of genetic modification and the potential risk were stated. The food products chosen were meant to represent a broad food category. A short description was included in the mail survey to let people know that genetic modification has no impact on taste, look, appearance or cost of the product.

In the case of meat products from cows and chickens fed on GM corn or soybeans the respondents were asked, "*Suppose cows or chickens are fed genetically modified corn or soybeans that are* ***grown using less pesticide or herbicide****. However, because the pesticide or herbicides are built into the plants,* ***there is a chance that insects that feed on them could be harmed****. Please state your willingness to consume meat products from these cows and chickens.*" Using consumers' response to the above question, the binary dependent variable *EATGM* was defined by assigning a value of 1 if the respondent chose "*I would be completely willing to consume these products", or " I would be somewhat willing to consume these products"* and 0 if the response was either, *"I would be somewhat unwilling to consume these products" or "I would be completely unwilling to consume these products*." A similar procedure was used to create a binary dependent variable (i.e., *EATGM*) for the GM fresh fruits and vegetables that are grown using less pesticides/herbicides, however the application of such technology may eventually replace the traditional varieties.

The following model is specified to predict the probability that an individual consumer would be willing to consume (eat) a specific GM food product:

$$\begin{aligned}EATGM = {} & b_0 + b_1 MALE + b_2 RISK + b_3 LOWSCORE + b_4 HISCORE + \\ & b_5 GMDISCUS + b_6 ORGBUY + b_7 LABELTIM + \\ & b_8 AGELT34 + b_9 AGE35\_44 + b_{10} AGE45\_54 + b_{11} HSCHOOL + \\ & b_{12} SCOLLEGE + b_{13} COL\_GRAD + b_{14} SRELIG + \\ & b_{15} LIBERAL + b_{16} CENTRIST + b_{17} WHITE + b_{18} BLACKAFR + \\ & b_{19} INCLT25 + b_{20} INC25\_50 + b_{21} INC51\_75 + b_{22} WEST + \\ & b_{23} SOUTH + b_{24} NOR\_EAST + b_{25} TRUIND + b_{26} TRU\_GOV + \\ & b_{27} TRU\_SCI + b_{28} TRU\_MED + e.\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The descriptive statistics and definitions of the explanatory variables included in the empirical models are presented in table1.

Model Estimation and results

Two different logistic models were estimated to explain and predict willingness to consume a GM product. The maximum likelihood estimates of the model parameters are obtained by using the econometric software LIMDEP. The estimated model coefficients, the associated t-ratios, and the marginal impacts of the explanatory variables on the dependent variable are reported in Tables 2. Reported also in this table are the estimated log likelihood functions of the unrestricted and restricted (i.e., all slope coefficients are zero) models, and McFadden's R^2.

Willingness to consume cows and chicken Fed on Genetically Modified Corn or Soybeans: Using Less Pesticides and Herbicides (Benefit): May harm insects feeding on them (Risk).

Among the 312 responses to the question relating to the willingness to consume meat products from cows and chicken fed on GM corn or soybean, 211(68%) are categorized as willing to consume (*EATGM*=1) and the remaining101 (32%) are classified as unwilling to consume meat products from cows and chicken fed on GM corn or soybeans (*EATGM*=0).

Coefficients of *MALE, GMDISCUS, SCOLLEGE, WHITE, BLACKAFR*, and *TRU-GOV* are positive and statistically significant at 10% or lower level. These estimated coefficients suggest that those respondents with some college education, those who discuss GM issues, are male, and are of White and African American race are more likely to consume meat products of cows and chicken fed on GM corn or soybeans than females, those who don't discuss GM, are of other races (e.g., Hispanic), and those who have less than a high school education. Similarly, individuals who trust government to tell truth, provide reliable information, have expertise, and can protect society's interests as compared to those who do not are more likely to consume these meat products than those who do not trust the government.

The statistically significant (at 10% or lower level) negative coefficients are *RISK*, *LOWSCORE, LABELTIM*, and *AGE35_44*. The coefficients suggest those individuals who are risk averse (i.e. those who based their consumption decision on the basis of the benefit and risk of the product being stated), those who take time to read labels when shopping, and those of middle age (compared to those above 55 years) are less likely to consume such products. Similarly, respondents who achieved a low score on 11 scientific questions measuring actual knowledge on GM compared to average scorers, will also be less willing to consume meat products from cows and chicken fed on genetically modified feed. The results suggest that region, organic purchasing behavior, religion, political affiliation, and various dimensions of trust (trust in scientists, industry, and medical professionals) do not have any influence on the willingness to consume the products.

The estimated marginal effects of the independent variables suggest that respondents who based their consumption decision on the stated benefit and risk were 21 percent less likely to consume these meat products. Those individuals who take time to read labels when shopping; are mid aged (35-44), or had low score in the GM quiz are also 25, 15, and 17 percent less likely to consume these products, compared to those who do not read labels, are older (over 55 years), and average scorers in the GM quiz. Males compared to females, individuals with some college education (vs. those with below high school) are 13 and 20 percent more likely to consume beef and poultry fed on GM corn or soybeans. Similarly, individuals who discuss GM issues, are white and of African American race, are 11, 27 and 17 percent more likely to consume these products compared to those who have not discussed, are of other races (Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander). Those individuals who trust the government to tell truth, to have expertise on GM, to provide useful source information, and can protect society on GM issues are 15 percent more likely to consume GM products.

The likelihood ratio test of overall model significance (i.e., all coefficients except the intercept are simultaneously zero) yields a test statistic of 87.81 which is higher than the 95 percent critical value of Chi-square distribution with appropriated degrees of freedom, implying that the model has significant explanatory power. Estimated McFadden's R^2 is 0.22. The estimated model correctly predicts 242 out of 312 sample observations with a prediction success rate of 78 percent.

Willingness to consume GM Fresh Fruits and Vegetables: Using less pesticides/herbicides (Benefit): May eventually replace traditional varieties (Risk).

Among the 312 responses to the question relating to the willingness to consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables using less pesticides and herbicides, 215(69%) are categorized as willing to consume (*EATGM*=1) and the remaining 97 (31%) are classified as unwilling consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables (*EATGM*=0).

Coefficients of *WHITE, SOUTH, TRUIND, TRU_GOV*, and *TRU_MED* are positive and statistically significant. These estimated coefficients indicate that white people compared to the other races (Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander) are more willing to consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables. People with confidence in the biotech industry, the government and the medical professional as reflected by the trust dimensions of telling the truth, having competent biotech expertise, being a good source of information and could protect society interests regarding genetically modified foods compared to those who do not are more likely to consume such genetically modified fresh fruits and vegetables. Similarly, people living in the southern region are more willing to consume GM fruits and vegetables compared to those living in the mid-west.

The statistically significant (at 10% or lower level) negative coefficients of *RISK*, *HISCORE*, and *AGE45_54* suggest that individuals who are risk averse (i.e. those to whom the benefit and risk of the product was stated), those with a high score in the GM quiz are less willing to consume such GM fruits and vegetables compared to those who were only told about the product benefit and those who had an average score in the quiz. Similarly, people aged between 45 and 54 years are less willing to consume such fruits and vegetables compared to those aged over 55 years. Income, gender, GM discussions, organic foods purchasing behavior, religion, and confidence in scientists variables do not have any influence on the willingness to consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables.

The estimated marginal effects of the independent variables suggest that individuals who are risk averse i.e., those individuals to whom risk and benefit of the product was stated, those aged between 45 and 54 years, are 34 and 13 percent less likely to consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables. Similarly, individuals who scored highly in the GM quiz are 11 percent less likely to consume such fruits and vegetables. On the other hand, the whites and those from the southern region are 23 and 10 percent more likely to consume GM fresh fruits and vegetables. Also individuals who have confidence in the biotech industry, the government and medical professionals are 11 to 25 percent more likely to consume such fresh fruits and vegetables than those who do not have such confidence.

The likelihood ratio test of overall model significance (i.e., all coefficients except the intercept are simultaneously zero) yields a test statistic of 137.43 which is higher than the 95 percent critical value of Chi-square distribution with appropriated degrees of freedom. This implies that the model has significant explanatory power. Estimated McFadden's R^2 is 0.36. The estimated model correctly predicts 254 out of 312 sample observations with a prediction success rate of 81 percent.

Conclusions

This study examines the influence of consumers' socio-economic characteristics and personal values on their willingness to consume GM food products. Empirical results indicate that consumer acceptance of GM food critically depends on the perceived risk and benefit of the product, their education and actual knowledge on GM, and their trust in the government, biotech industry, and medical professionals on matters relating to GM foods.

These findings have important implications for the scientific community, government and policy-makers, as well as for producers and marketers of GM food products. The results show that benefits and perceived risks may have a strong influence in the consumption of the GM food products. Trust in institutions to protect public interest is critical for boosting consumption of the GM food products, and a lack of this trust may seriously hinder complete acceptance of transgenic technology.

This study analyzes consumer willingness to consume GM food products that confer clear benefits but also involve inherent risks. Future research should explore issues such as consumer acceptance of GM products involving gene transfer between plant and animal species and appropriate regulatory and labeling policy for GM food products.

References

Baker, G. A., & Burnham, T. A. (2001). Consumer Response to Genetically Modified Foods: Market Segment Analysis and Implications for Producers and Policy Makers, *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 26, 387-403.

Bredahl, L. (1999). Consumers' Cognitions with Regard to Genetically Modified Foods. Results of a Qualitative Study in Four Countries, *Appetite*, 33, 343-360.

Engel, K.-H., Schauzu, M., Klein, G., & Somogyi, A. (1995). Regulatory Oversight and Safety Assessment of Genetically Modified Foods in the EU. In: K.-H. Engel, G. Takeoka & R. Terahishi (Eds.), *Genetically Modified Foods: Safety Aspects*. Washington, D. C.: ACS.

Gamble, J., Muggleston, S., Hedderly, D., Parminter, T., & Richardson-Harman, N. (2000). *Genetic Engineering: The Public's Point of View*. Report No. 2000/249, The Horticulture and Food Research Institute of New Zealand, Auckland.

Grossman, M. R., & Endres, A. B. (2000). Regulation of Genetically Modified Organisms in the European Union, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 378-434.

Hallman, W., Adelaja, A., Schilling, B., & Lang, J. T. (2002). *Consumer Beliefs, Attitudes and Preferences Regarding Agricultural Biotechnology.* Food Policy Institute Report, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Hamstra, I. A. (1998). *Public Opinion about Biotechnology: A Survey of Surveys*. European Federation of Biotechnology Task Group on Public Perceptions on Biotechnology, The Hague.

Genetic Modification and Food (1998). London, U.K.: Institute of Food Science and Technology (IFST), Position Statement.

Kelley, J. (1995). *Public Perceptions of Genetic Engineering: Australia, 1994*. Final Report to the Department of Industry, Science and Technology, Department of Industry, Science and Technology, Canberra.

Limdep Version 7.0 User's Manual (1998). Plainview, NY: Econometric Software Inc.

Lusk, J. L., Daniel, M. S., Mark, D. R., & Lusk, C. L. (2001). Alternative Calibration and Auction Institutions for Predicting Consumer Willingness to Pay for Non-genetically Modified Corn Chips, *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 26, 40-57.

Macer, D., Bezar, H., Harman, H., Kamada, H., & Macer, N. Y. (1997). Attitudes to Biotechnology in Japan and New Zealand in 1997, with International Comparisons, *Journal of Asian and International Bioethics*, 7, 137-143.

Macfadden, D. (1974) *Conditional Logit Analysis of Qualitative Choice Behavior*. In Zarembka, P.editor. Frontiers In Econometrics. Academic Press, New York, NY.

Macfadden, D. (1974) "*Econometric Analysis of Qualitative Response Models*." In Grilliches, Z. & Intrilligator, M. editors. Handbook of Econometrics, Volume 2. North Holland, Amsterdam.

Moon, W., & Balasubramanian, S. (2001). A Multi-attribute Model of Public Acceptance of Genetically Modified Organism, Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Agricultural Economics Association, August 5-8, Chicago.

Nelson, C. H. (2001). Risk Perception, Behavior, and Consumer Response to Genetically Modified Organisms, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 1371-1388.

Train, K. (2002). *Discrete Choice Methods with simulation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables			
Variable	**Description of the variable**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev**
MALE	1 = respondent is male; 0 = otherwise	0.44	0.50
RISK	1=respondent to both stated product risk and benefit question on willingness to consume; 0=otherwise (respondent answered only the benefit question)	0.51	0.50
LOWSCORE	1 = correctly answered less than 6 (out of 11) basic question on biological science; 0 = otherwise	0.24	0.43
MIDSCORE*	1 = Correctly answered between 7 to 9 (out of 11) basic questions on biological science; 0 = otherwise	0.38	0.49
HISCORE	1 = correctly answered more than 9 (out of 11) basic question on biological science; 0 = otherwise	0.38	0.48
GMDISCUS	1=participated in GM debates;0 otherwise	0.48	0.50
ORGBUY	1= respondent buys organic food regularly; 0=otherwise	0.16	0.37
LABELTIM	1= respondent takes time to read the label contents; 0 otherwise	0.68	0.47
AGLT34	1= age less than 35 years; 0 = otherwise	0.25	0.43
AGE35_44	1= age between 35-44 years; 0 = otherwise	0.22	0.42
AGE45_54	1= age between 45-54 years; 0 = otherwise	0.25	0.43
AGE_A55*	1=age above 55 years;0otherwise	0.28	0.45
BHSCHOOL*	1=below high school;0=otherwise	0.04	0.20
HSCHOOL	1 = high school education; 0 = otherwise	0.29	0.46
SCOLLEGE	1 = college education (including graduate degree); 0 otherwise	0.25	0.43
COL_GRAD	1=four year college and graduate degree; 0=otherwise	0.42	0.49
SRELIG	1 = attends church at least once a week to several times a month; 0 = otherwise	0.72	0.45
LIBERAL	1 = identifies himself/herself as liberal; 0 = otherwise	0.19	0.39
CENTRIST	1 = identifies himself/herself as conservative; 0 = otherwise	0.54	0.50
CONSERV*	1 = identifies him/herself in between; 0 = otherwise	0.27	0.44
WHITE	1 = respondent is white (Caucasian); 0 otherwise	0.87	0.34
BLACKAFR	1 = respondent is African American; 0 otherwise	0.06	0.25
OTH_RACE*	1=respondent is other race; 0 otherwise	0.07	0.25
INCLT25	1 = (annual) respondent with income less than $ 25,000; 0 = otherwise	0.18	0.39
INC25_50	1 = (annual) income between $26,000-$50,000; 0 = otherwise	0.27	0.45
INC51_75	1=(annual) income between $50,000-$74,000	0.26	0.44
INC_A75*	1=(annual) income between above $75,000	0.28	0.45
WEST	1 = respondent resides in western states; 0 = otherwise	0.24	0.43
MID_WEST*	1 = respondent resides in Midwest; 0 = otherwise	0.29	0.46
SOUTH	1 = respondent resides in southern U.S.; 0 = otherwise	0.31	0.46
NOR_EAST	1 = respondent resides in north eastern U.S.; 0 = otherwise	0.16	0.36
TRUIND	1 = that responded can trust industry (tell truth, provide useful information, has expertise, and protect society) on GM Issues; 0 = otherwise	0.46	0.50

Table 1 (cont.)			
TRU_GOV	1 = that responded can trust Government (tell truth, provide useful information, has expertise, and protect society) on GM Issues; 0 = otherwise	0.58	0.49
TRU_SCI	1 = that responded can trust scientists (tell truth, provide useful information, has expertise, and protect society) on GM Issues; 0 = otherwise	0.81	0.39
TRU_MED	1 = that responded can trust Medical professionals (tell truth, provide useful information, has expertise, and protect society) on GM Issues; 0 = otherwise	0.74	0.44
Notes: Asterisk implies that the variable is the base group and was dropped to avoid dummy variable trap			

Table 2. Maximum Likelihood Estimates of Model Coefficients

	Less Pesticides/Herbicides: May harm insects feeding on corn or soybeans			Less Pesticides/Herbicides: May eventually replace traditional varieties		
	Cows and chicken Fed on GM corn or Soybean			GM Fresh fruits and vegetables		
	Coefficient	t-ratio	Marginal Effects	Coefficient	t-ratio	Marginal effects
Constant	0.0134	0.011	0.003	-0.9333	-0.652	-0.150
MALE	0.6793*	2.182	0.128	0.3122	0.898	0.050
RISK	-1.0748*	-3.537	-0.205	-2.1316*	-5.658	-0.339
LOWSCORE	-0.7853*	-2.026	-0.165	-0.6483**	-1.492	-0.114
HISCORE	-0.2117	-0.622	-0.041	-0.0321	-0.083	-0.005
GMDISCUS	0.5606**	1.788	0.108	0.4487	1.244	0.072
ORGBUY	-0.4250	-1.09	-0.087	-0.4615	-1.089	-0.081
LABELTIM	-1.4986*	-3.913	-0.251	-1.4236*	-3.239	-0.197
AGLT34	-0.0194	-0.046	-0.004	-0.0642	-0.134	-0.010
AGE35_44	-0.7110**	-1.692	-0.149	-0.2227	-0.464	-0.037
AGE45_54	-0.2017	-0.496	-0.040	-0.7100**	-1.563	-0.126
HSCHOOL	0.9751	1.258	0.170	1.3038	1.348	0.179
SCOLLEGE	1.1876**	1.522	0.196	1.1451	1.188	0.154
COL_GRAD	0.8809	1.116	0.164	1.3362	1.371	0.202
SRELIG	0.1937	0.571	0.038	0.5302	1.405	0.091
LIBERAL	0.0719	0.148	0.014	0.1508	0.279	0.024
CENTRIST	-0.4873	-1.359	-0.093	0.0001	0.000	0.000
WHITE	1.2205*	2.142	0.274	1.1544*	1.915	0.229
BLACKAFR	1.1955	1.56	0.173	-0.2883	-0.344	-0.050
INCLT25	-0.1960	-0.413	-0.039	-0.2416	-0.447	-0.041
INC25_50	-0.5484	-1.356	-0.112	-0.2973	-0.634	-0.050
INC51_75	0.1860	0.446	0.035	0.2210	0.473	0.034
WEST	0.3190	0.784	0.059	0.0061	0.013	0.001
SOUTH	0.2386	0.631	0.045	0.6810*	1.554	0.101
NOR_EAST	0.0360	0.081	0.007	0.5690	1.120	0.081
TRUIND	-0.1765	-0.544	-0.034	0.6979**	1.890	0.111
TRU_GOV	0.7526*	2.356	0.149	1.4795*	4.101	0.254
TRU_SCI	0.0946	0.231	0.019	-0.4958	-1.072	-0.072
TRU_MED	0.1877	0.541	0.037	1.1523*	2.921	0.214
LL	-152.54			-124.67		
Restricted LL	-196.45			-193.38		
Chi-Square	87.81			137.43		
DF	28			28		
McFadden's R^2	0.22			0.36		
Prediction Success	78%			81%		

* α=. 05 and ** α=. 10